

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAY 21 2007**

Serial No. 09/765,623

REMARKS**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

REASONS FOR ENTRY

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because no claims are amended herein and thus no further search by the Examiner is required since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

On pages 2-3 of the Action, claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that the newly added recitation, "providing means for providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by the user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password" is not described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

First, page 14, line 27, to page 16, line 6, of the present specification clearly shows the operation of server 40. Specifically, this portion of the present specification describes "when it has received a request from a client". (See page 15, lines 1-2). Page 15, lines 4-5, describe S1 as follows: "The CPU 40a obtains a user ID and password stored in a packet received". According to the above mentioned context of the present specification (as well as Fig. 9), the "packet received" in S1 is equivalent to "a request from a client" in lines 1-2 of page 15. That is, the request (packet received) from a client includes a user ID and password.

Second, S2 of the flow chart of Fig. 9 tests whether the requesting user is a regular user (see page 15, lines 6-10). This test uses the group specifying table of Fig. 4, in which both user IDs and passwords are registered. A person of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the flowchart of Fig. 9 requires every request packet to include a user ID and a password because if

Serial No. 09/765,623

either one is missing, the test at S2 will reject the request regardless of whether the requesting user has already logged in.

Third, S4 uses the received user ID and password to find the group to which the requesting user belongs (see page 15, lines 13-15, of the present specification). S4 also assumes that the request contains both user ID and password.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing explanations of the present application, it is respectfully submitted that the flowchart of Fig. 9 and the corresponding written description clearly provide sufficient support for the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-7 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KUROSAWA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,047,288) IN VIEW OF COX ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,510,466)

The rejections of claims 1-7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by the user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password.

On page 5 of the Action, the Examiner notes that Kurosawa et al. fails to teach or suggest the features described above. Thus, Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox") is cited as disclosing this feature, citing Fig. 4 and blocks 234 and 236 of Cox.

The specification of Cox states:

If a user identification and password information is contained in the request at block 234, user login operations are executed (See column 12, lines 53-55, of Cox).

If it were true that, as the Examiner states, every request is accompanied by the user identification and password information, block 234 of Cox would always direct the process to block 236. That is, every request invokes user login operations, regardless of whether the user has logged in. This hypothetical result would not make sense to one of ordinary skill in the art. Rather, it is more reasonable to consider that the block 234 is intended to skip user login operations when the user has already logged in. That is, login operations may not take place when the request lacks user identification or password information, or both.

In contrast, according to embodiments of the present invention, the user ID and

MAY 21 2007

Serial No. 09/765,623

password stored in a received packet are tested (see S1 and S2 in Fig. 9 of the present application). It is determined whether the user has already logged in to the server (see S5 in Fig. 9). Therefore, every request from a user is supposed to be accompanied by a user ID and a password, regardless of whether the user has already logged in to the server.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password, as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 7. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6 and 7 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and inherit its patentable recitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 also patentably distinguish over the references.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 21, 2007

By: Michael P. Stanley
Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1480, Alexandria, VA 22313-1480

On May 21, 2007

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Michael P. Stanley

Date: May 21, 2007